Dear Group Art Unit 2171 worker,

Re: USSN 09/881,501, Alpern, et al., *Redirection of misses in queryable caches,* filed 6/14/01
my docket oracle01.013

Attached is a response **after final** in the above patent application; please forward it immediately to Examiner LeRoux.

Respectfully submitted

Gordon E. Nelson #30,093
Attorney of Record

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(oracle01.013)

Applicant:	Alpern, et al.	Paper No.: N/A	
Application No:	09/881,501	Group Art Unit: 2171	
Filed:	6/14/01	Examiner: E.P. Leroux Fax: 703-872-9306	

Title: *Redirection of misses in queryable caches*

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Response to a final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Summary of the prosecution

Examiner mailed a first Office action in the above patent application on 9/26/03. In the Office action, Examiner rejected claim 1under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,487,641, Cusson, et al., *Dynamic caches with miss tables*, having an effective filing date of 12/2/99, U.S patent 5,832,521 (henceforth "Cusson"), or Klots, et al, *Method and apparatus for performing consistent reads in multiple-server environments*, issued 11/3/98 (henceforth "Klots"), and rejected claims 1 and 2 as anticipated by U.S. patent 5,974,129, Bodnar, *Distributed virtual cache method for use in a database query control system*, issued 10/26/99 (henceforth "Bodnar'). Examiner further rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Bodnar in view of Klots and claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Bodnar and U.S. published patent application 2992/0124082, San Andres, et al., *Architecture and associated methods for providing users of a distributed services with an interactive directory of network content*, having an effective filing date of 6/7/95 (henceforth "San Andres"). In a response filed 12/12/03, Applicants amended their claims to better express their increased understanding of the significance of their invention and to better protect their invention and demonstrated that the amended claims were fully supported by the Specification as filed and that they were patentable over the Klots and Bodnar references.

On 3/15/04, Examiner mailed a final Office action in which he employed three new references to reject all of the claims. Claims 5-7, 10-12, 15-16 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.